IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

KQLMSTRQNG BLESSINI AXUM-EL A/K/A TROY AXUMEL

٧.

Petitioner,

CIVIL ACTION NO. JKB-13-1058

CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY * Respondent.

MEMORANDUM

On April 8, 2013, Kqlmstrqng Blessini Axum-el, also known as Troy Axumel, filed a petition for writ of mandamus. (ECF No. 1). Affording the self-represented petition a generous construction, it appears that Axum-el is complaining about state criminal charges filed against him in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. He seemingly claims that the circuit court has no jurisdiction over him as the "artificial/fictitious legal entity" of Troy Axumel, given that he is a "flesh and blood Moorish/Muurish National Citizen Member of a foreign state, foreign government, and foreign nation (foreign as in foreign to the de facto United States federal corporation created in the year 1871 in Washington, D.C. but not foreign to the organic lands of North America authorized to be known and recognized as the de jure continental United States Republic)." *Id.* He accuses the circuit court and its prosecutors and judges of being in contempt of court by continuing to threaten him and his family with "terror, threat, duress, and coercion" by means of summons and warrants for "kidnapping and inhumane abduction" of a "documented foreign Moorish/Muurish national member of a foreign government..." He seeks to invoke the court's mandamus relief to compel the circuit

court to cease its pursuit of criminal charges against him as the "fictitious defendant" known as Troy Axumel.

The petition was not accompanied by the required civil filing fee or indigency motion. Petitioner shall not, however, be required to cure this deficiency. Mandamus relief is a remedy only used in extraordinary circumstances. See Kerr v. United States Dist. Court, 426 U.S. 394, 402 (1976); In re Beard, 811 F.2d 818, 826 (4th Cir. 1987). Moreover, a federal court does not have jurisdiction over state entities or employees in an action for writ of mandamus. See Gurley v. Superior Court of Mecklenburg County, 411 F.2d 586, 587 (4th Cir. 1969); see also AT & T Wireless PCS v. Winston-Salem Zoning Bd. of Adjustment, 172 F.3d 307, 312 n. 3 (4th Cir. 1999).

Further, the legal assertions raised in the document amount to nonsensical rubbish designed to thwart prosecution. Reduced to its essence, petitioner's claim is that he is a "Moorish American" and that, based on his ancestry, the State of Maryland does not have jurisdiction to prosecute and imprison him. There is no basis in the law for such a claim. The fact that a group claiming to be "Moorish Americans" has written documents that might support this idea does not establish a valid claim. Moreover, petitioner is not the first person to raise this or similar claims based on an alleged status as a "Moorish American." These claims have been rejected. See Pitt-Bey v. District of Columbia, 942 A .2d 1132, 1136 (D. C. 2008); Ferguson-el v. Virginia, 2011 WL 3652327 (E.D. Va. 2011); Albert Fitzgerald Brockman-El v. N.C. Dep't. of Corr., Civil Action No. WO-09-633 (M.D. N.C. 2009), appeal dismissed for lack of a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, 373 Fed. Appx. 332 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, —— U.S. ———, 131 S. Ct. 168 (2010). The court is

The state court docket shows that on October 31, 2012, the state of Maryland filed second-degree assault, deadly weapon, and reckless endangerment charges against petitioner under the name of Troy

Case 1:13-cv-01058-JKB Document 2 Filed 04/16/13 Page 3 of 3

aware of no instance where the United States has recognized the so-called "Moorish/Muurish Nation" as a sovereign. Because it plainly appears that petitioner is not entitled to any relief in this court, the petition shall be dismissed.

A separate Order shall follow reflecting the ruling set out herein.

Dated this ______ day of April 2013.

BY THE COURT:

James K. Bredar

United States District Judge